A.—The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT (Mr. R. W. Scaldwell).—

(*a*) A statement is attached. (*Vide* Appendix.)

(*b*) A statement is attached. (*Vide* Appendix.)

(*c*) Statements are attached. (*Vide* Appendix.)

(*d*) The answer is in the affirmative.

Mr. K. KENCHAPPA.—What was the reason for suddenly raising the *thadi* water-rate to Rs. 6-8-0 in 1925-26 when the supply of water was only intermittent, while all along, from 1913-14 till 1925-26, it was only Rs. 5 even though the supply was continuous? And again, what was the reason for reducing the water-rate to Rs. 3-8-0 in 1927-28?

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina S. P. Rajagopalachari).—No definite rate had been fixed in those years. So, the rate had to vary according to the availability of water-supply and seasonal conditions every year. Subsequently, however, in view of representations made in regard to difficulties felt, the rate was reduced as a matter of concession or relief.

Mr. K. KENCHAPPA.—Should not a standard rate be levied instead of varying rates?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—A standard rate has been prescribed. But certain special concessions were shown in certain years with reference to conditions existing then, and no one need be sorry for it.

Expenditure on Primary Education.

Q.—17. Mr. B. SRINIVASA RAO (Bowringpet Taluk).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) the number of schools that were in existence before the rules under the Elementary Education Regulation came into force and the total expenditure that was being incurred on such schools;

(*b*) the increase in the number of schools each year after the introduction of these rules and the total number of schools in existence now;

(*c*) the annual Government grant made and the amount of education cess recovered from the raiyats annually (districtwar) since the introduction of the above rules?

A.—The GENERAL SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Mr. M. Venkatesa Iyengar).—

(*a*) There were 6,395 schools before the Elementary Education Regulation came into force and the total expenditure on them was Rs. 21,40,664.

(*b*) There has been a decrease in the total number of these schools in the subsequent years owing to amalgamation of separate Adikaranataka schools and girls' schools with general boys' schools.

The number of schools as on 31st March of each year is as noted below:—

Year	*No. of Schools.*
1932	... 6,199
1933	... 6,243
1934	... 6,254
1935	... 6,250
1936	... 6,286

104 schools have been opened during 1936-37.

(*c*) Statements furnishing the information are placed on the table. (*Vide* Appendix.)

Mr. B. SRINIVASA RAO.—After the introduction of the Elementary Education Regulation, why has expenditure on account of primary education become less?

Mr. M. VENKATESA IYENGAR.—The figures furnished do not include the expenditure incurred out of the cess income. If that is also taken into consideration, the expenditure will not be less. On the other hand, it will be more.

Mr. B. SRINIVASA RAO.—We were not paying the cess formerly. I am referring to the expenditure incurred directly by the Government. The Government were giving a grant of nearly Rs. 21 lakhs formerly and they have now reduced it.

The DIRECTOR of PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Mr. N. S. Subba Rao).—Before the Regulation came into force, education cess was being levied; only, the expenditure incurred out of the cess collections was not being shown separately. The

expenditure on education included both the Government grant and the cess realisations. Now, they are being shown separately. That is all the difference. So, it should not be inferred that the expenditure on education is now less than before.

Mr. B. SRINIVASIENGAR.—Will it not be possible to show separately the grant from Government and the expenditure out of the cess income, so that it may be possible to know at any time whether there is any increase in the expenditure under each head or not?

Mr. N. S. SUBBA RAO.—That is possible.

Mr. B. SRINIVASIENGAR.—Will that procedure be adopted from next year?

Mr. N. S. SUBBA RAO.—The suggestion may be considered.

Mr. H. KRISHNAMURTHYACHAR.—According to the Education Memorandum, how many more schools have yet to be opened?

Mr. N. S. SUBBA RAO.—More than 4,000.

Mr. H. KRISHNAMURTHYACHAR.—How many additional schools have already been opened?

Mr. N. S. SUBBA RAO.—205.

Mr. H. KRISHNAMURTHYACHAR.—When will the remaining number of schools be started?

Mr. N. S. SUBBA RAO.—As and when funds become available.

Mr. H. KRISHNAMURTHYACHAR.—What is the use of levying education cess if this important question is left open like that?

Mr. N. S. SUBBA RAO.—The cess was being levied even before the Regulation was introduced.

A MEMBER.—Is education cess levied on the salaries of officers?

Mr. N. S. SUBBA RAO.—Yes, in cases where officers also happen to own lands.

The MEMBER.—Is it not a fact that only officers are being benefited by the cess paid by raiyats, as the former are not paying anything at all for all the educational facilities which their children are enjoying?

The PRESIDENT.—That amounts to discussing the question.

Restoration of Gundarlahalli Tank.

Q.—20. **Messrs. G. SHANKARA SETTY** and **P. NAGARAJIAH** (Pavagada Taluk).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) how many years ago did the tank situated in Gundarlahalli Pavagada Taluk, breach;

(*b*) whether the fact has come to the notice of Government that the tank in question was serviceable to six or seven villages by means of channels and *talapariges*;

(*c*) whether any representation was made by the raiyats of those parts to the Government by means of petitions about the non-use of the tank and for its restoration;

(*d*) are Government aware of the poverty-stricken condition of the raiyats on account of the scarcity of water supply as a consequence of the breach of the tank;

(*e*) whether the raiyats of those villages have agreed to pay their quota of contributions for the restoration of the tank?

A.—**The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT** (**Mr. R. W. Scaldwell**).—

(*a*) The tank breached last, 38 years ago.

(*b*) Lands of 3 villages were being irrigated by *talapariges* under the tank when the tank received a full supply of water.

(*c*) The answer is in the affirmative.

(*d*) The poverty of the people is not due entirely to the breach of the tank.

(*e*) The restoration of the tank has been ordered to be left to private enterprise; so the question of contribution does not arise.

Mr. P. NAGARAJIAH.—May I know why the restoration of the tank has not been taken up yet, though it breached 38 years ago?

Mr. R. W. SCALDWELL.—It is a private tank and its restoration must be done by the land-holders themselves.